DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 393 168 EA 027 417

AUTHOR Reynolds, David
TITLE The Ineffective School.
PUB DATE 95
NOTE 30p.; Paper presented at the European Conference on Educational Research (Bath, England, United Kingdom, September 14-17, 1995).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Educational Assessment; *Educational Change; *Educational Improvement; Educational Research; *Effective Schools Research; Elementary Secondary Education; Foreign Countries; Organizational Climate; *Resistance to Change; *School Effectiveness
IDENTIFIERS *United Kingdom

ABSTRACT

The problems involved in reversing ineffective schools have begun to engage researchers, policy makers, and practitioners. This paper conceptualizes the extent to which ineffective schools have to be understood as "different" from schools with other levels of effectiveness, and speculates which types of improvement strategies are most appropriate to them. The paper describes problems involved in implementing the "turnaround" processes in two South Wales schools recognized as ineffective. A conclusion is that the United Kingdom research community may have been deficient in its understanding of ineffective schools. It is proposed that ineffective schools be viewed as having characteristics antithetical to effectiveness. The paper poses 13 questions for the school-effectiveness and school-improvement community to consider as possibilities for turning around ineffective schools. In order to be transformed, ineffective schools need prior competencies, a school culture able to handle the rational/empirical paradigm of change, and a cohesive organization. The intervention must be able to reach staff who historically have been uninvolved. Educators should also decide whether externally imposed practices or improvement of existing practices is most appropriate and intervene at the formal organizational, cultural, and relational levels. It is argued that what the schools may need are directive skilling, means-oriented activities, and potentially quasi-therapeutic programs that give the schools knowledge and skills they lack. One table is included. (Contains 17 references.) (LMI)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 393 168

The Ineffective School

David Reynolds
University of Newcastle upon Tyne, U.K.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

D. Reynolds

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC).

(Paper presented at the European Conference on Educational Research, Bath, England, September 14-17, 1995).

EA027417

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Introduction

The problems involved in 'turning around' schools which are perceived to be 'failing' in the OFSTED definition or which are ineffective viewed from a school effectiveness perspective are now beginning to engage the three communities of researchers, policy makers and practitioners much more than hitherto. Part of this represents an understandable reaction to the risk of closure that can now follow on from apparently unsatisfactory inspections and action plans. Additionally, the recent reporting of the characteristics of some of those schools which appear to have improved their functioning over the three years in which academic results have been routinely published has also served to direct attention towards schools in the 'ineffective' category.

From the research community also have come some enhanced concerns about these schools, their problems and their potential importance as generators of knowledge for the effectiveness and improvement knowledge bases (Gray and Wilcox, 1994; Reynolds and Packer, 1992; Reynolds, 1991). What follows in this chapter is an attempt to conceptualise the extent to which ineffective schools have to be understood as 'different' from schools with other levels of effectiveness and to speculate upon the

types of improvement strategy which may be appropriate for them. It is based upon two small-scale empirical studies: the hitherto partially reported study from South Wales of a consultancy-based attempt to turn around a historically underperforming secondary school (Reynolds, 1987; Murgatroyd and Reynolds, 1985), and a previously unreported study of the introduction of school effectiveness knowledge into a similar school between 1990 and 1994, the period in post of a new headteacher who was personally and professionally highly committed to the school effectiveness knowledge base and to its utility. It is also based upon the experience of doing in-service work, particularly 'Baker days', in a large number of secondary schools of varying levels of apparent effectiveness over the last ten years, mostly in Wales, and the experience of recently joining the Governing Body of a primary school, which is currently in receipt of OFSTED 'special measures'.

The Policy and Intellectual Context of Concerns about Ineffective Schools

In the broader educational context, it is entirely possible that a higher and higher proportion of schools are becoming ineffective in that they fall below a threshold of basic organisational adequacy. This may be as a consequence of the following factors:

1. The retrenchment of local authorities over the last five years may have removed the props and supports that have kept some schools from 'bottoming out',

leaving some schools now to find their natural level of ineffectiveness;

2. The enhanced requirements involved in being organisationally competent or effective as a school in the 1990s may have differentiated out a higher proportion of ineffective school regimes who are unable to cope with enhanced responsibilities in areas such as local management, budgeting and development planning;

3. Enhanced levels of stress for all schools and of pressures upon them may have differentiated schools out over a much wider continuum, with the stress producing both more effectiveness and more ineffectiveness depending upon schools' organisational capacity to 'cope';

4. The effects of naturally occurring educational changes in which individual schools exercise of their powers in such areas as their choice of in-service, their school development planning and their teacher appraisal results in the 'raising of the ceiling' by competent schools who improve the quality of their practice but in the 'lowering of the floor' by the less competent, who abuse or mis-use new opportunities and become more ineffective;

5. The effect of market based educational policies in leading to the removal of children, particularly more able children, from certain apparently low-performing schools with consequent adverse effects upon school ability balance and staff morale. Some

schools may be in a spiral of decline, in which ineffectiveness is increased by the consumer reaction to that ineffectiveness.

The intellectual problems faced by those of us who wish to understand these ineffective schools may be severe, however. Our existing knowledge bases may not reflect their contribution representatively because the 'drop out' schools that refuse to participate in effectiveness research are likely to be weighted towards the ineffective. Within school improvement, it is likely that less effective schools have not played a full part in generating our knowledge base because they are less likely to hire school improvement persons or to be visited by such persons. The other routine involvements between effectiveness/improvement persons and teachers in such areas as higher degrees and in continuing professional development are also likely to be lower within ineffective institutions than in effective ones. Simply, we may not have much knowledge about, or relevant to, these schools because we haven't very much routine research or professional involvement with them.

Additionally, the paradigm within which school effectiveness has been historically situated can be argued to have involved a deficit model of the ineffective school, based upon conceptualising and studying the effective school and then turning to the ineffective school to see what it is that the ineffective

school may lack. This intellectual structure, with the aim of bringing the 'good' things of the effective school to the ineffective school to improve it, is particularly in evidence in the work of the American school effectiveness movement from the very earliest initial links made between school effectiveness and school change by Edmonds (1979).

However, rather than seeing ineffective schools as 'not having success characteristics', it might have been more productive to see them as 'having failure characteristics', and to view them as having factors not necessarily seen in the effective schools. Additionally, the problem of the ineffective school may not be just the lack of the effectiveness correlates and the possession of additional specific factors generating ineffectiveness - it may be that the ineffective schools have antithetical characteristics to the effectiveness ones present in other effective schools. As an example, an ineffective school may not evidence simply the absence of 'strong purposeful leadership' - it may possess additionally 'fragmented, confused and inconsistent leadership' (Myers, 1994).

In our purported strategies for the improvement of ineffective schools, we again have intellectual and practical problems. As Gray and Wilcox (1994) note, most school improvement work concerns the study of more general processes of improvement, and even the recent

more sophisticated blends of improvement/effectiveness/evaluation strategies of practitioners like Hopkins et al (1994) are quite clearly based upon experiences in quite atypical school samples. Besides, one is not sure from the existing range of effectiveness and improvement studies which of the effectiveness correlates are the results of effectiveness rather than the cause, and one is also not sure whether the factors that have been identified in the studies of schools that have become effective are the same as the factors that would be necessary to get schools that are 'ineffective' to 'effective' status. This latter issue about the possibly different factors related to improvement rather than to effectiveness is, of course, the subject of the current ESRC funded study in Gloucestershire and Shropshire secondary schools directed by John Gray, David Hopkins and myself.

The argument here is, then, that we may have been deficient in our exposure to, and understanding of, the ineffective schools within the United Kingdom effectiveness and improvement research community. Whereas in the United States there have been some attempts to understand and conceptualise the problems of such schools (of in the case of the 'depressed' schools of Louis and Miles (1990) and the 'stuck' schools of Rosenholtz (1989)), we have as yet no sizeable British enterprise. What follows is a preliminary and brief description of work with two 'ineffective' schools in an

attempt to begin some British discussion of the ineffective school context.

Study One: Turning Around an Ineffective School Through School Effectiveness Based Consultancy

This research and development activity took place over a three-year period in a comprehensive school taking from a very deprived valley community within Gwent local education authority. The school in the late 1980s featured in the bottom three for 'value added', based upon simple local education authority analysis of census data and examination results. An approach for help to David Reynolds and Stephen Murgatroyd by the headteacher had followed from the outbreak of a considerable degree of media attention being devoted to the issue of why schools in Wales were underperforming on examination achievement by comparison with those in England. An initial whole-day session with school staff was used to outline the school effectiveness knowledge base, with further opportunities for staff to discuss this in groups and to consider whether they wished to persevere further with effectiveness/improvement related activities. Positive initial staff reactions, plus the desire of the Headteacher and senior management team to improve the school, led to a programme of work that involved:

1. 'pupil pursuit' work that aimed to establish baseline descriptions of school climate and to encourage teachers to visit each other's classrooms and share professional practice;

2. on-site training activities to transmit effectiveness knowledge and in the diagnosis of organisational dysfunction, utilising a conventional OD knowledge based approach;
3. attending a large number of Senior Management Team meetings to verify what were the needed organisational changes (the team initially had no agenda, no minutes and a completely informal structure);
4. work with the Headteacher to improve his management style, 'where it was possible to see him making impulsive decisions, making no decisions, making considered decisions and then not acting upon them, and making decisions that other people in the school should make decisions (as with the working groups he set up)' (note from our original Consultancy Report);
5. work to improve communication and management in the school, where informal networks were used rather than formal ones (e.g. the weekly news consisted of administrative trivia) and where there were no mechanisms for communicating issues 'upwards' or 'sideways' for resolution. There were additionally no clear definitions of managerial roles and no clear responsibilities for middle management.

Our work in the school led us to view its culture as one that was posing severe difficulty for any purported change attempts. Knowledge of the literature on

organisational development (Sarason, 1971) and school improvement (Fullan, 1982) had not prepared us for the considerable shock of encountering a culture with the following characteristics and multiple barriers to change. There were:

1. The Fantasies - that change was someone else's job other than the body of line staff within the school (e.g. the job of the Senior Management Team or of the Headteacher). Indeed the majority of the staff cried out for 'top down' change that would tell them what to do, not for ownership of the change themselves.
2. The Clingons - the belief that the school staff should carry on doing things in the way that they had done formerly because 'we've always done it this way!'
3. The Belief of Safety in Numbers - the reluctance of individuals in school to stand out from the prevailing group culture, even though they may have wanted to, because of a desire to 'hide' behind the group;
4. The Fear of Failure - the reluctance of the staff to take the risks that successful change involves, fearing that failed change would further damage them;

5. The Externalising of Blame - the ability of the school staff to avoid the implications of evidence like examination achievement showing their ineffectiveness by projecting their difficulties onto the children, and by explaining their failure as due to deficiencies in home background;

6. The Knowledge Deficiency - the absence of any understanding about alternative policies, the nature of the present institution's functioning, about how to change, about how to evaluate change, and about how to relate to each other;

7. The Fear of Outsiders - the belief that outside school persons had little to offer the school, which reflected the fear that outsiders may see the school's ineffectiveness. This was hidden behind a 'macho' facade that negated the potential importance of the outsiders as help agents;

8. Grossly Dysfunctional Relationships - the presence of numerous personality clashes, feuds, personal agendas and fractured interpersonal relationships within the staff group, which operated to make rational decision-making a very

difficult process. The tendency was to take stands on issues based upon 'reactive' decision-making, based upon the characteristics of persons putting forward ideas and proposals rather than upon the intrinsic merits or demerits of the ideas/proposals themselves;

9. The Presenting Problems/The 'Real' Problems - the school's apparent presenting problems on which it had wanted definitive advice (e.g. the problems that had followed from the move to a five-period day from one of eight periods) were masks for the 'real' problems of morale, competence and feelings of failure that the school evidenced. In a situation like this, discussion often appeared 'unreal' and superficial because the school could not reveal the real problems that it wanted help with.

It was clear within the first six months of the process that the introduction of the school effectiveness knowledge into the school was a thoroughly problematic activity. In a staff group that was unused to discussing education, the discussion of 'means' and 'goals' generated much heat, because the staff had not realised

until this point that they differed significantly among themselves as to what the role of the school should be within their type of community. Working parties that were set up and subsequently 'hi-jacked' by different interest groups led to an even greater solidification in the new heterogeneous ideologies on offer and a further significant disintegration of what had been a solidaristic consensual staff. The various mechanisms of pupil pursuit, involving teachers shadowing their colleagues' interactions with a pupil in the course of a morning or afternoon of normal school, did not produce the outbreak of the 'ownership' of change, of the sharing of effective strategies or of the collegiality that had been hoped for. The involvement with the Senior Management Team, intended to systematise school governance through adequate communication of team decisions and through the introduction of proper minuting and representation in the dealings of the team, led to the undermining of the Headteacher's position.

The result of our involvement with the school was a considerable degree of turbulence then in its internal dynamics. Staff turnover, which had been historically of the order of five to six per cent per year, increased within a year to double that figure, partly as a result of the virtually complete changeover of the Senior Management Team as its members went to other schools. Examination results showed no improvement over three years, nor did examination entry rates, often a more

sensitive initial indicator of internal change. Pupil absence rates by contrast actually increased markedly in the first six months of our work in the school when the staff disturbance was at its height, with the attendance rate falling by some five per cent compared to the previous year's comparable time period. Although the attendance rate had recovered to its old levels within eighteen months and although there was evidence of more enhanced competence, open-ness and of some embryonic management structures as our three-year period of time in the school ended, no one could say that the ineffective school was in any way 'turned around'.

Study Two: A New Headteacher Attempts to use School Effectiveness Knowledge to Improve His School

This study involved a study of a new headteacher over four years as he attempted to change his school through giving a high profile within in-service training to school effectiveness and school improvement insights. He took over the school in January 1990 and remained until the end of 1993, leaving then somewhat symbolically for a headship in a rural area of Botswana! His involvement with the school effectiveness community also included attendance at three International Congress for School Effectiveness and Improvement meetings, presenting papers at two of them on what he was trying to do with his institution. In value added analyses conducted by the LEA, the school was in the bottom four out of thirty-two on examination results (using predictors based upon

use of an ability measure at age eleven as a predictor variable).

The effectiveness knowledge input to his staff involved two entire in-service training days, consultancy based support to his staff as they attempted certain crucial changes (e.g. the integration of children with special needs) and the involvement of some of the senior management team in a Master's course taught at a local university on school effectiveness and school improvement.

The headteacher's programme of activities with the school over his four years in post centred upon a number of areas frequently discussed as associated with positive school outcomes:

1. There was intensive work with parents and with the community to improve the image of the school and to improve the levels of participation of parents in the school and their interest in their children's education (it had been customary to obtain an average attendance of only 20 per cent of parents at the termly 'Year meetings' held for each year of the school, and the parental attendance at the annual Prize Day numbered normally perhaps 75, indicating that since over 100 children got prizes or certificates of some kind, many even of these children were not supported by their parents' attendance).

This work involved parental newsletters and intensive work with the local news media highlighting the school's achievements. The school in fact became the one with the highest public visibility out of the approximately 100 secondary schools situated in South Wales.

2. Extensive whole-school policies were implemented to update the school's academic organisation involving changed routine assessment procedures, integration of 'remedial' streams (as they had still been entitled in 1989) into mainstream classes, curriculum reform and the attempted generation of the effective schools 'correlates' of high expectations, high academic pressure and frequent use of homework.

3. Policies were followed to encourage 'ownership' of school management and decision making processes by the staff, by means of improving the communication flow from staff to Senior Management, by having an 'open door' policy to encourage staff to drop in and talk to the Headteacher, and by means of an extensive committee/working party system to involve as many people on the staff as possible in routine determination of policies.

Staff reaction to the school effectiveness knowledge was only moderately favourable, with many seeing it as 'not right for our sort of children' who by contrast needed firm punishment and other quasi correctional

solutions to improve their achievements. The school saw itself as not being any kind of 'problem' and as not needing to change radically - the low levels of school outcomes were externalised onto the catchment area of the school, a late 1950's council estate which had been increasingly used as a dumping ground for perceived problem families by the local authority.

Many of the attributes of the school culture noted in School A were also present, in the case of this school combined with a very weary fatalism that was related to the age distribution of the staff, since three-quarters of teachers were over their mid 40s. Staff relationships were more harmonious than in the case of School A, with the major split being with one group of staff nicknamed 'the old lags' by the rest of the staff, who had strong reciprocated friendship patterns with each other, and very hostile attitudes to outsiders of the group, very negative reactions about the need to change and very negative attitudes and behaviours towards the children and their parents.

School B had already been involved in a series of routine administrative solutions to its problems involving a series of 'tightening' of procedures practised in such areas as pupils' punishments, pupil absence, pupils' classroom behaviour, and pupils being out of a classroom during lessons (by contrast to School A which had done little tightening in any of these

areas). As the time needed for the practice of school development began to increase, a normal corollary of any ownership-related school improvement scheme, many of the administrative procedures became weaker, leading to a widespread feeling that the school was falling apart. The rump of staff noted above (the old lags) then used these feelings to discredit the process of school development that the Headteacher was trying to implement.

School B also evidenced by contrast to School A a small number of apparently very competent staff, probably attracted to the school because of its location in the Welsh capital. These staff were in many cases helped with responsibility allowances by the new Headteacher, which seemed to lead to further enhancement of their professional competence and personal self-esteem. However, the presence within the same staff group of a rapidly rising 'ceiling' of the professionally competent together with a floor ('the rump') who celebrated professional incompetence meant that the variation between the school staff in their practices and in their levels of individual and Departmental effectiveness was greater at the end of the Headteacher's programme of activities than at the start. For pupils in the school, greater heterogeneity of staff behaviour may well have led to perceptions of an apparently more confusing and inconsistent school than had existed hitherto.

The results of the series of programmes over four years were to generate a more weary, more fatalistic and more cynical staff group than at the programme's start, with the mechanisms that had been used to attempt to create ownership leading to exhaustion. There was no major evidence of success, either in improved school processes or in enhanced outcomes, that could have been used to improve morale or to build a coalition of persons to radically transform the school. Public examination results were as follows:

	Entered 1 or more exam.	Achieved 1 or more exam.pass	Achieved 5 or more A-C exam. passes
School 1982/83	61	58	8
School 1990/91	71	63	8
School 1991/92	84	67	11
School 1993/94	90	73	8

The school's rates of entry and of achievement of one or more passes at any grade virtually parallels the overall improvement for all schools in Wales over the decade, and for the years for 1990-94. On the key publicly used indicator of 'five or more' subject passes at grades A-C the school's position was static for a decade and represented a decline relative to other schools in Wales.

The only other positive change, was an increase of two to three per cent in the school's mean attendance rate over the four years, bringing it from the high 70s

to the low 80s, a change that exceeded the minor change in attendance for all schools in Wales.

How Do We Turn Around the Ineffective School?

We must be clear firstly about which schools are concerned, since clearly nearly all schools are 'ineffective' relative to the top decile of effectiveness, and clearly the bottom half of schools are ineffective relative to the top half of the distribution by effectiveness. What we would argue this chapter relates to is schools which are probably in the bottom ten or fifteen per cent of the distribution by effectiveness, although some schools with higher overall levels of effectiveness may have some features, or some Departments, with aspects of the ineffective schools' organisation, culture and relational patterns. It goes without saying that effective schools would be most unlikely to have more than a few staff or Departments with the sorts of processes noted in our two case studies above.

The precise methods we might utilise to turn around such schools are of course a matter of considerable controversy. Gray and Wilcox (1994) argued that any improvement schemes needed to motivate teachers by capturing their enthusiasm and their commitment to change, and to show teachers that they will gain personally from any successful programme. Ownership of

the change attempt by staff, even if only by a small group of staff initially, is also argued as likely to be essential. Brown, Duffield and Riddell (1995) also seek to 'root' school improvement in ineffective schools (and indeed in all schools) in a clear and precise understanding of how teachers make sense of their worlds and construct their professional ideologies of practice. What are offered below is a further, rather different set of possibilities for the improvement or 'turning around' of such schools, posed as questions for the effectiveness and improvement community to consider:

1. Will the ineffective schools have the prior competencies that are clearly required to engage in the round of activities (such as school development planning or involvement in school improvement activity) which may be needed to improve their organisational functioning? If not, how do we develop these competencies?
2. Will the schools be able to engage with the 'rational/empirical' paradigm if they possess a culture of 'non rationality' or 'competing rationalities'? How do we change this culture?
3. Will the schools be able to act as an organisation in the sense of adopting any cohesive organisational approach if there are numerous cliques, a substantial heterogeneity of practice and a fragmented rather than interlinked staff group? How

do we deal with the relational problems in these schools?

4. Will school improvement and/or school development activities that focus on change to the formal organisational level of the school be successful in engaging the commitment of staff members who have been historically mostly uninvolved with the school level and whose focal concerns are not 'organisational' but more 'teaching and curriculum'? Is teacher effectiveness research appropriate for these schools, rather than school effectiveness research?

5. Will the schools engage with activities which have been brought to them from 'outsiders' in the worlds of higher education, school effectiveness research and school improvement practice?

   Is the solution to their problems to rather encourage they themselves to work on their own within-school variation, where there are likely to be some Departments relatively more effective than others (Fitzgibbon, 1992) and potentially some Departments absolutely effective when measured in the context of Departments in all schools?

6. Will school improvement and school development activities generate a greater variation in teacher behaviours if applied to ineffective schools, as the gap between moving 'leading edges' and static 'trailing edges' increases? Given the evidence that shows effective schools as reducing the range of

teacher behaviour and ideology (Teddlie and Stringfield, 1993), how do we prevent the range of behaviours increasing in ineffective schools over the improvement time?

7. The process of improving ineffective schools is likely, given their problems, to involve intervention in the three areas of the formal organisation, the culture and thirdly the relational area. How do we operate on the three areas together?

8. School improvement and development can be historically described as attempting to 'improve the good' or to 'accentuate the positive' in school settings. In ineffective schools would it be more effective to attempt to 'eliminate the negative', which would impact greatly both on the range of student achievement scores and also on the mean (the thesis here is that improvement in a small number of 'low effectiveness' staff may generate a substantial effect upon mean school performance)?

9. Should we consider different outcomes as being the important goals for the development of ineffective schools? Change in ineffective schools is likely to take a much longer time than in schools of other levels of effectiveness. Given the general agreement that it is likely to take two to four years to substantially improve examination performance in an 'ordinary' school, in an ineffective school it might be unwise to expect

major outcome change in academic areas in under four to five years (the recent OFSTED list of rapidly improving schools one would be inclined to take as evidence for year-on-year variation in performance rather than for rapid improvement). Given the importance of the attainment of success criteria in building and sustaining improvement, is there a case for improvement in ineffective schools being targeted more at easily alterable outcomes like the attendance rate (where change in a minor number of individuals can have grossly disproportionate effects) rather than at academic outcomes, or is there a case for targetting at more intermediate level outcomes (pupil attitudes for example) in ineffective schools?

10. Change in ineffective schools may need intervention of a quasi therapeutic nature to make any change possible. Situations of 'presenting' and of 'real' problems, of a lack of openness, of dysfunctional relationships and of various pathological cultural states may not be changeable without the techniques historically utilised to change individuals and other institutions exhibiting such problems. What are these skills and how do we acquire them?
11. Change in ineffective schools may be best attempted by bringing the outside knowledge that such schools 'need' to the schools in the form of a school insider rather than in the form of the threatening

outsider. Simply throwing ideas about school effectiveness, school improvement and school change at the ineffective school is likely to be even more problematic in the ineffective school than in the cases of others of higher effectiveness levels. The ideas need to be attached preferably to a person, as in the process of demic diffusion, rather than simply being allowed to root or not through cultural diffusion.

Using school personnel as school change agents - as Trojan horses - and transmitting to them the range of skills and knowledge that ineffective schools need, as in the Cardiff Programme of Institutional Change (Reynolds et al, 1989), may be the best way of improving practice.

12. If getting reinforcement of a positive kind is problematic for teachers in ineffective schools because of a situation of staff hostility to organisational development, should we see the most useful reinforcement for change as coming from the pupils? If so, is it imperative to distance school improvement in ineffective schools from attitudinally based change models of school improvement and utilise only behaviourally orientated programmes, whereby the change in individual teacher behaviours is reinforced by the reaction of pupils, which in turn leads to attitude changes by staff?

13. Is focussing upon the discussion of school goals early on in the process of school development (e.g. Hargreaves and Hopkins, 1991) appropriate for ineffective schools where 'goals debates' may reveal and promote dissensus? Is a 'means' orientation (i.e. the concentration upon organisational features with goals implicit) a more suitable way of school development and of building staff competence, with the aim of engaging with issues of 'mission', 'goals' and the like later in the process of improvement?

Is indeed a technological or technique based approach (for example, using coaching sessions at lunchtimes to develop candidates who may possibly improve to score a grade 'C' at GCSE) more likely to succeed in ineffective schools than the other, broader approaches (for example, a policy to improve negative teacher expectations)?

Is the most important thing in the ineffective school for staff to do something and then later think about what the broader picture may be?

Conclusions

This chapter has used the experience of direct involvement in two attempts to turn around an ineffective school and the experience of more general in-service work with such schools to argue for the potential context specificity of the improvement programmes and their

characteristics that should be utilised with these schools.

It is argued that what the schools may need is directive skilling, means orientated activities, and potentially quasi therapeutic programmes to give the schools knowledge and skills which they currently do not possess. At heart the 'problem' of the ineffective school simply throws into sharp relief the more general dilemma of how we reconcile the need for teachers and their institutions to develop from their present state with the need to ensure they own that process of development, in order to generate the likelihood of the process of development continuing. How we conceptualise the problem of knowledge transmission and knowledge generation for ineffective schools is likely to have wider importance for the improvement community more generally.

REFERENCES

Brown, S., Duffield, J. and Riddell, S. (1995) School Effectiveness Research: The Policymakers' Tool for School Improvement?. Paper in the Newsletter of the European Educational Research Association (in press).

Edmonds, R. (1979) Effective schools for the urban poor, in Educational Leadership, 37, 15-18, 20-24.

Fitzgibbon, C. (1992) School Effects at 'A' Level, in Reynolds, D. and Cuttance, P. (eds) School Effectiveness. London: Cassell.

Fullan, M. (1982) The New Meaning of Educational Change. New York: Teachers' College Press.

Gray, J. and Wilcox, B. (1994) The Challenge of Turning Around Ineffective Schools. Paper presented to the ESRC Seminar Series on School Effectiveness and School Improvement, October 1994.

Hargreaves, D.H. and Hopkins, D. (1991) The Empowered School. London: Cassell.

Hopkins, D., Ainscow, M. and West, M. (1994) School Improvement in an Era of Change. London: Cassell.

Louis, K.S. and Miles, M. (1992) Improving the Urban High School. London: Cassell.

Murgatroyd, S.J. and Reynolds, D. (1985) The Creative Consultant, in School Organisation, 4, 3, 321-335.

Myers, K. (1994) Why Schools in Difficulty May Find the Research on School Effectiveness and School Improvement Inappropriate for Their Needs. Unpublished paper.

Reynolds, D. (1987) The Consultant Sociologist, in Woods, P. and Pollard, A. (eds) Sociology and Teaching. London: Croom Helm.

Reynolds, D. (1991) Changing Ineffective Schools, in Ainscow, M. (ed) Effective Schools For All. London: David Fulton.

Reynolds, D. et al (1989) The Cardiff Programme - An Effective School Improvement Programme Based on School Effectiveness Research, in International Journal of Educational Research, 13, 7, 800-814.

Reynolds, D. and Packer, A. (1992) School Effectiveness and Improvement in the 1990s, in Reynolds, D. and Cuttance, P. (eds) School Effectiveness. London: Cassell.

Rosenholtz, S. (1989) Teacher's Workplace: The Social Organisation of Schools. New York: Longmans.

Sarason, S. (1971) The Culture of the School and the Problem of Change. Boston: Alleyn and Bacon.

Teddlie, C. and Stringfield, S. (1993) Schools Make a Difference. New York: Teachers College Press.